

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

B5

Date:

**JUL 02 2012**

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

File:

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

*Elizabeth McCormack*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center. The subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO).<sup>1</sup> The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen or reconsider. The motion will be dismissed, the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed, and the petition will remain denied.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). Based on the plain meaning of “new,” a new fact is found to be evidence that was not available and could not have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding.<sup>2</sup> Counsel submitted documents with the motion that are identical to the documents submitted with the previous appeal. A review of the evidence that counsel submits on motion reveals no fact that could be considered “new” under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) and, therefore, cannot be considered a proper basis for a motion to reopen.

Motions for the reopening of immigration proceedings are disfavored for the same reasons as are petitions for rehearing and motions for a new trial on the basis of newly discovered evidence. *INS v. Doherty*, 502 U.S. 314, 323 (1992) (citing *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. 94 (1988)). A party seeking to reopen a proceeding bears a “heavy burden.” *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. at 110. With the current motion, the petitioner has not met that burden. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or U.S. Citizenship and Immigration (USCIS) policy. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). A motion to reconsider contests the correctness of the original decision based on the previous factual record, as opposed to a motion to reopen which seeks a new hearing based on new or previously unavailable evidence. *See Matter of Cerna*, 20 I&N Dec. 399, 403 (BIA 1991).

A motion to reconsider cannot be used to raise a legal argument that could have been raised earlier in the proceedings. *See Matter of Medrano*, 20 I&N Dec. 216, 220 (BIA 1990, 1991). Rather, the “additional legal arguments” that may be raised in a motion to reconsider should flow from new law or a *de novo* legal determination reached in its decision that could not have been addressed by the party. Further, a motion to reconsider is not a process by which a party may submit, in essence, the same brief presented on appeal and seek reconsideration by generally alleging error in the prior decision. *Matter of O-S-G-*, 24 I&N Dec. 56, 58 (BIA 2006). Instead, the moving party must specify the factual and legal issues raised on appeal that were decided in error or overlooked in the initial decision or must show how a change in law materially affects the prior decision. *Id.* at 60.

---

<sup>1</sup> The previous AAO decision listed an incorrect receipt number of [REDACTED]. The decision addressed the issues presented in the case with receipt number of [REDACTED]. As the substance of the appeal addressed the issues arising in the appeal filed for the instant proceeding, [REDACTED] the provision of the incorrect receipt number constitutes harmless error.

<sup>2</sup> The word “new” is defined as “1. having existed or been made for only a short time . . . 3. Just discovered, found, or learned <new evidence> . . . .” WEBSTER’S II NEW RIVERSIDE UNIVERSITY DICTIONARY 792 (1984) (emphasis in original).

The present motion to reconsider does not allege that the issues, as addressed in the previous AAO decision on appeal, involved the application of precedent to a novel situation, or that there is a new precedent or a change in law that affects the AAO's prior decision. Instead, counsel provided a statement on the Form I-290B nearly identical to the statement provided on the prior Form I-290B. The statement did not reference the AAO decision previously entered. As noted above, a motion to reconsider must include specific allegations as to how the AAO erred as a matter of fact or law in its prior decision, and it must be supported by pertinent legal authority. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3); see *Matter of Medrano*, 20 I&N at 219; *Matter of O-S-G-*, 24 I&N Dec. at 58-60.

For the foregoing reasons, the motion to reopen and reconsider is dismissed. The burden of proof in visa petition proceedings remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The motion to reconsider and the motion to reopen are dismissed, the decision of the AAO dated August 31, 2010 is affirmed, and the petition remains denied.